



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—CAESAR, CICERO AND FERRERO.

II.

But we have reached a point in our inquiry when we must somewhat exclusively follow the greater figures of that critical time. First let us take up a few matters of Cicero and his consular year. As to the chronology of the Catilinarian speeches, when *pro Murena* was delivered by Cicero, it was in November, *after* Catil. I and II. Catiline himself had thrown off the mask in the north. It is pointless to say that Catiline hoped for Murena's conviction of *ambitus*. The only person benefited would have been the eminent jurist Servius who drew up the indictment. Ferrero has not studied *Muren.* 47 with any attention, where Servius' far-reaching proposals for electoral reform are outlined.—What evidence has F. for saying (I 382) that Murena's defense was arranged for *before* the election of 63 B. C. If the election of Murena and Silanus was in July 63 (F. follows John), how are we to understand why Servius postponed his prosecution to November? Did F. even *glance* at *pro Murena*? There (§ 4) Cicero looks upon his consular year as a voyager nearing port. Still more luminous are these words (§ 78): “non usque eo L. Catilina rem publicam despexit atque contempsit, ut ea copia, quam secum eduxit, se hanc civitatem oppressurum arbitraretur.—Latius patet illius sceleris contagio quam quisquam putat; ad plures pertinet. *Intus, intus, inquam, est Equus Troianus,*” etc. No *dénouement* of incriminating documents nor Mulvian Bridge as yet. Lentulus and his fellow conspirators had not yet descended from their wooden horse.

“Cicero tried to ingratiate himself with the historical nobility” (F. I. 377)—(which we are continually told had dwindled and dwindled close to the point of extinction) of Rome.—Cicero strove for distinction before the Greco-roman world of his own generation. The following is often overlooked. Cicero, the foremost patronus of the financial class, esp. of the

publicani, was as much opposed as anyone to that movement of *Repudiation*. In November or thereabouts, 44 B. C., looking back upon the past and summing up things with the mature vision of nineteen years later he wrote (de off. 2, 84) "nec enim ulla res vehementius rem publicam continet¹ quam *fides* (credit), quae esse nulla potest, nisi erit necessaria solutio rerum creditarum. *Numquam vehementius actum est quam me consule, ne solveretur* (to bring about repudiation). Armis et castris temptata res est ab omni genere hominum et ordine: quibus ita restiti, ut hoc totum malum de republica tolleretur". Cicero in that swan song of his reflective writing was weighing and valuing things more clearly, may I say with more spiritual earnestness than ever before. And these words are of quite extraordinary historical value. That year 63 then, Cicero's consular year and that of Caesar (59) soon to follow, invite us to bring into discussion however briefly a great name, viz., that of Theodor Mommsen. Even to place the greatest of Roman antiquarians in juxtaposition with the rhetorical Italian feuilletonist might seem inexcusable. But it is not altogether inept to do so. Mommsen's delineations and the underlying estimates are deeply colored by his Hegelian philosophy with its dialectical unfolding of things and the occasional worldspirit which like the Apis on the Nile, is sometimes revealed to a favored generation. And indeed this side of quondam Hegelianism is about as tolerable as that Apis-cult of Egypt.—Caesar is the revelation of the worldspirit: *wir neigen uns vor ihm*, Mommsen actually wrote . . . But woe to those who barred the path of the worldspirit. Ferrero on the other hand with his avidity of selecting a shining mark, seeks to make of Caesar a human being of no towering proportions, but simply carried forward on the crest of waves which were infinitely stronger than he. Again F. pursues a sociological thesis. Of course unprejudiced historiography and any full or unbiased study of ancient tradition fare most woefully in this programme.

It is well known that Mommsen² after 1850 was compelled to seek academic work in Switzerland, being deprived of his Leipzig chair by the conservative reaction in Germany. In

¹ The term *συνέχεις* of Polybius: "is a conservative force".

² Then but thirty-three years old.

or during this Swiss exile he seems to have conceived the only 'popular' book about Rome he ever wrote. His heart was still throbbing with bitter passion against everything conservative. He injected all of these feelings into his delineation of the disintegrating Roman republic. Does not—we ask it candidly—does not such injection of a personal experience vitiate genuine historiography? It certainly does.—Mommsen as an antiquarian and Mommsen as a judge of politics, Mommsen as dominated by political convictions or sympathies—these are virtually two distinct personalities. It is not at all necessary to argue about it. It is quite sufficient to transcribe a very concise anthology from his own pages, to realize his angry, his unbalanced exaggeration. "Marcus Cicero, *notorisch ein politischer Achseltraeger*".¹ Cato: "dieser junge kühle Gelehrte, dem die Schulmeisterweisheit von den Lippen troff" (155): dieser Wolkenwandler im Reich der abstrakten Moralphilosophie (the *one* man in public life whose judgment penetrated Caesar's political designs from the beginning)—: "Er war unfähig einen politischen Zweck auch nur zu begreifen . . . "Der Don Quixote der Aristokratie". Of the summary execution on December 5, 63 B. C.: "Elender hat sich wohl nie ein Gemeinwesen bankerott erklärt". Of Pompey: "der Weg zum Thron". "Nach den unerhörten (sic) Gewaltthaten gegen den Volkstribunen Metellus". Of Pompey: "wie nahe es ihm auch gelegt war" (by the worldspirit) "die weisse Binde um seine Stirn zu legen". "Dieser in allem, nur in seinen Ansprüchen nicht, ganz gewöhnliche Mensch". "Er gehörte zu den Menschen die wohl eines Verbrechens fähig sind, aber keiner Insubordination". "Zum zweiten Male hatte Pompeius abgedankt". "Der ganze Herrenstand", "Dass der politischen Astronomie zum Trotz die Weltgeschichte weiter gieng". Angry, abusive, violently partisan caricatures, but not—in these ebullitions—tenable historiography. Think of Curio, Antony, Vatinius or other servitors of the towering Julius in their *contiones*: Mommsen in his spirit of ferocity appears fairly as one of that company.—There is another matter: Mommsen's chapter headings and summarizing superscriptions remind a sober student of this period of that which in technical logic is called *petitio principii*: the assump-

tion as proved of that which is first to be proved. "Coalition der Praetendenten", "Pompeius and Caesar's Gesammtherrschaft." The aim, monarchy, is good. Hence all means are commendable. What at Caesar's usurpation? Hegelianism. Mommsen, then, over and over again operates with the political conceptions, certainly with the political sympathies and antipathies, of his recent life. To do so is not any less anti-historical than Ferrero's injection of Comteism (nay of Lombroso's psychiatric valuations of Crime as well as of Genius) into the presentation of those times. We may call the first writer violent and angry, and the later naïve: both are in the wrong.

But to resume our examination of concrete details. Ferrero is somewhat too positive as to the pact which Cicero's colleague Antonius is said to have made with the latter about provincial emoluments (Att. 1, 12; 13; 14). Ferrero evidently has not studied the commentary of Tyrrell, an omission which no one can afford who in our time undertakes to write the history of the moribund Roman Republic. "Teucris" certainly is not a pseudonym for Antonius himself. The silly legend about Clodia setting her cap for Cicero (Plut.) is swallowed whole by Ferrero as it is by Boissier—they will not pass over so piquant a morsel.—"Me vero nihil istorum ne iuvenem quidem movit unquam; ne nunc senem".¹

In the matter of Caesar's election as pontifex maximus the date in March (63 B. C.) acc. to Ovid Fasti 3, 419 refers not to Caesar but to Augustus; v. Peter's note. This is a good point to illustrate the reckless manner in which Dio often constructs a causal nexus by a violent *hysteron proteron* or other defiance of chronology. He has the people elect Caesar to that honor: Why? On account of Caesar's vote of Dec. 5, 63, whereas that pontifical election came long before. The scenting of hidden motives is a veritable passion with Dio. (cf. 37, 37.), and this again shows how hurriedly he used the materials furnished him by Livy.—It is not very easy at this stage of classical studies to throw a positively new light upon these matters. Ferrero however employs his private psychological and neurological diagnosis (the skulls unfortunately are not available) as his sources of new light. From these he derives novel conceptions of characters. So of Caesar:

¹ Fam. 9, 26, 2.

Lombroso's son-in-law has discovered the particular spring which moved this important watch. It is a "rhythmical oscillation between prudence and impetuous energy". Once discovered, this neurotic law is far better than the ball of yarn given to Theseus by Ariadne.—"La nervosa indole di Cesare era una strana oscillazione ritmica di temerità e di prudenza". (I 376, cf. 406, 439, 448, II 42-43, 189, 250, 356, 412, 462, 473, 498).

When Balbus visited Cicero in December, 60 B. C., with communications from Caesar, what warrant has anyone (p. 440) to say that Balbus talked with Cicero on his own account? A close study of Cicero's correspondence in chronological sequence demonstrates that Caesar wished to gain Cicero's support through flattery, a most effective inducement in that quarter: we also perceive that Caesar with consummate adroitness masked the *fait accompli* of the triumvirate.

There was nothing *sudden* in the policy of Caesar's consular year. The comparison with Pericles and the Attic democracy is unmeaning to a degree. The agrarian laws both 1. and 2. (April, May) were postulated by the consistent policy which Caesar had pursued ever since he had entered public life. He it was no doubt who had drawn the bill of Rullus in 64-63, and a *lex Iulia agraria* now was absolutely necessary for him.

There is confusion in Ferrero as to the governor of Cisalpine Gaul in 59. In 59 Metellus Celer (husband of Catullus' Lesbia) was not proconsul there at all. He died in his own house on the Palatine (Cic. p. Caelio 59). It was in 62 that he governed there (Fam. 5, 1, 2). It was therefore not the death of Clodia's husband which made Cisalp. Gaul available for the plebiscite introduced by Vatinius. Ferrero pleases himself with the fancy that Caesar primarily was the agent of "democracy": that which is "democrazia pura" with the Italian feuilletonist, is "Coalition der Praetendenten" in Mommsen's vision. Ferrero also affirms that the success of the Triumvirate was unforeseen. Hardly so; probably Caesar, Crassus and Pompey had a fair knowledge as to how many votes in the Senate they could control. Incidentally, before we leave Caesar's land-law, how can anyone refer to the older Public domain of Rome as a form of Communism?

There are some inaccuracies in the intrigue of Caesar and Vatinius to use the informer Vettius so as to gain or secure lasting enmity or distrust between Pompey and the aristocracy during Caesar's now impending proconsulate. The only primary source is Att. 2, 24. The transcription by Signor Ferrero is hurried and the details are somewhat jumbled in his relation. Vettius named Brutus *before* his own arrest, and omitted that name in his second list. That Caesar invited Cicero *anew*, early in 58, when he was about to set out for Gaul to become one of his legates there, for this statement of Ferrero's I know not the source.—I return in all respects to Ludwig Lange with increased admiration. Lange's simple and singularly exact, (though dispassionate,) and truthloving, impartial relation more than ever seems to me to tower above all the other accounts. Crabbed, venomous and grotesquely unfair is Drumann, with all the micrology of his detail, e. g. 5, p. 605: "Unverkennbar (sic) erwartete er nur den günstigen Zeitpunkt, Caesars Abgang nach Gallien, um Philippiken anzustimmen; aber Caesar erfasste ihn, der auf seine Kosten (sic) nochmals einen fünften December zu feiern gedachte, *in der Republik nur sich selbst¹ liebte, und, gleich unfähig zum Erhalten und zum Zerstören* [an impediment then at least to those who wished to destroy] *nur andern lästig wurde*, mit seiner eisernen Hand und warf ihn zu Boden: dann gieng er nach Gallien".

If anything in History is manifest, clear, impressive and beyond controversy, it is the endowment and the comparative nobility of the larger traits of character in Aurelia's only son. The factitious and fatuous efforts of Ferrero to reduce Caesar to the level of the common or the commonplace, remind me of a single tide of the sea, and the transitory pattern which *it* makes on the sands of time and of human story. It roars bravely and churns or mats the billions of grains with sovereign power, but its effects last not for even a watch of the night.

Ferrero's ambition, both for his general thesis and for the rewriting of Caesar's Commentarii has tempted him to snatch with avidity at monographs like those of Rauchenstein on Caesar's Helvetian campaign. Why not also simply deny

¹ Cicero was one of the most consistently and resolutely grateful men in history.

the actuality of Marius' victories over Cimbri and Teutons? These seem to me to afford approximately the same material for negation or doubt. The *fait accompli* is the umpire of all this sort of pseudo-scholarship. But Rauchenstein-Ferrero have been answered somewhat beyond their deserts by T. Rice Holmes in *Class. Quarterly* 1909, 203 sqq. Why *κύνα δέπειν δεδαμμένην*? Why indeed? "It is dangerous to mate scepticism with imagination: for the offspring thereof will be illegitimate fiction". . . . After the fall of Alesia (52 B. C.) when the impending consulate of Marcus Marcellus and many other things and mutations in Rome—among them the unmistakable however guarded drifting away of the other dynast from Caesar's interests and concerns—were rising with portentous seriousness before the political vision of Caesar, *this* I hold was the point of time¹ when the latter conceived the design of this publication. The majority of special students agree in this matter with Schneider rather than with George Long. Caesar knew well the aims of most of his political antagonists, to most of whom indeed he had become the *bête noire* of existence. They had endeavored to entangle him with Catiline, they had striven almost immediately after the beginning of 58 B. C. to undo his consular legislation . . . ; would so rich a field as his long *imperium* in Northwestern Europe have been neglected by them, provided he had come to Rome once more as a private person into the purview of the *quaestiones* whose panels had been so largely reconstituted by Pompey? And in any trial, be it for *maiestas* or for *repetundarum*, it would, I believe, have been Caesar's own *Lex Iulia Repetundarum* defining and curbing and limiting provincial government as never before, with the financial final accounts in triplicate—this very statute drawn by Caesar himself, I say, would probably have been the keen instrument by which men like Domitius, Cato, Bibulus, the Marcelli and others would have sought his destruction. In that last sultry period, before the breaking of the storm of civil war, details or any minor questions of precision in the long story of that *imperium* were negligible or evanescent to the deeper sentiments held by public men in that crisis.

The larger aspects, such as the justification of entire cam-

¹ *Annals of Caesar* p. 266 sqq.

paigns, the enormous emoluments of these latter poured into the political game¹ at Rome—*these* I am convinced would have appeared in the indictment and in the trial. And it is this, I believe, which was in the soul of the nobler Iulius, when, accompanied by his young staff-officer Asinius Pollio he strode among the dead on the field of Pharsalos, and uttered these words with a sigh²: τοῦτο ἐβουλήθησαν, εἰς τοῦτό³ με ἀνάγκης ὑπηγάγοντο (better ὑπήγοντο), ἵνα Γάιος Καῖσαρ ὁ μεγίστους πολέμους κατορθώσας, εἰ προηκάμην τὰ στρατεύματα, κἄν κατεδικάσθην.—And this consistent partisan bitterness of the times is preserved for us in a passage, which, originally, may have been penned or elaborated in contemporary writers or pamphleteers like Tanusius Geminus, Actorius Naso, Ampius Balbus or Caecina.

“Nec deinde ulla belli occasione, ne iniusti quidam ac periculosi abstinuit, tam *foederatis* quam infestis ac feris gentibus *ultro lacessitis*, adeo ut senatus quondam legatos⁴ ad explorandum statum Galliarum mittendos decreverit etc. (Sueton 24).

Another point: the capital was *not* kept very well informed as to Caesar's operations; we may go further and say that the majority had no very great curiosity in the premises. Cicero's correspondence shows that. It is only when the *legatio* of Quintus and his own new support of Caesar's interests (cf. de prov. cons.) fills him with a special concern, that these campaigns figure at all. Ferrero treats all these things somewhat in the fashion in which a modern journalist might deal, say, with the bulletins arriving from the Boer wars and discussed with due continuity by the organs of public opinion in London or Paris. “Caesar received couriers from Rome daily”: not at all: hence the large *bundles*⁵ of letters which of course covered quite a period of time. The creation of a “plutocratic class” among the Kelts, is an affirmation by the author. The belief that Gaul was “pacata”, at the end of the

¹ As instruments of Ambitus.

² Plut. Caes. 46.

³ Cf. Die Historische Schriftstellerei des C. Asinius Pollio, by Kornemann, Teubner, 1896, p. 684. Where however in the further relation the two words ῥωμαιστί and ἑλληνιστί should be transposed in the text.

⁴ This from Tanusius, cf. Plut. Caes. 22.

⁵ Ad Q. Fratr. 2, 12, 4: Sed ille scripsit ad Balbum, fasciculum illum epistolarum, in quo fuerat et mea et Balbi, totum sibi aqua madidum redditum esse . . .

Belgian campaign or late in 57 B. C. (B. G. 3. 7.) furnishes F. material for one of his numerous houses of cards, viz. that Caesar with great audacity executed "annexation" of Gaul, and that he had endless troubles subsequently with "public opinion" in Rome, because risings occurred continually . . . , or that he wished (II 48) to re-establish his credit which had suffered severely through the performances of Clodius.—The passage in Dio 39, 25 is misunderstood by Ferrero. We may go further and say that Dio made an utterly misleading inference. The matter really before us is the *Ten Legati* whose appointment symbolized the *fait accompli* of a new province calling for permanent organization and administrative settlement.¹ Dio: (as though the results were not really accepted by the senate too) καὶ ὁ δῆμος, τά τε κατεργασμένα αὐτῷ θαυμάζων, ὥστε καὶ ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς ἄνδρας ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ δεδουλωμένοις πανταλῶς τοῖς Γαλάταις ἀποστέλλαι. When one studies Dio's relation of the Gallic wars patiently and in detail, one reaches the conclusion, that he selects or passes over, contracts or expands, *ad libitum*, but that he has no other record than Caesar himself; that he freely pragmatizes or even dramatizes sometimes (e. g. 40, 6, Ambiorix), but that otherwise he merely gives us a ratiocinative and analytical rewriting of Caesar's account. Dio, Suetonius and Plutarch have the item of Caesar's cryptogram or cipher (perhaps derived from Oppius), which of course does not occur in Caesar's own memoirs (cf. Dio 40, 9. w. Sueton. 56.). While Dio reserves for himself the freedom of absolutely no restraint or self-limitation in digging or delving for motives, he is very negligent (to put it mildly) in presenting his Livian data in some fair chronological sequence. The final naval battle with the Veneti Dio (39, 42) relates with the lively fancy of a historical novel—Apart from the computation, and, we must add, apart from the imputation of motives and a certain coordination of data (often worthless through chronological confusion) it is indeed the height of *naïveté* to "control" Caesar's Commentarii by Dio, as Ferrero did and that too at second hand through a mono-

¹ Cf. Annals of C. 112, 12 Phil. 28. Fam. 1, F. 10 (of 56 B. C.) a result of Luca, "nam et stipendium Caesari decretum est *et decem legati*". Such a result too was the *de Prov. cons.* of Cicero. i. e. that dealing with Gaul but not that dealing with Macedon and Syria.

graph of a recent Italian scholar. The employment of Appian 2, 17 to furnish data for the theme of *Cesare, il gran corruttore* (Fer. 2, 48 and 67) one may let pass, (i. e. that Caesar financed the election of his creatures and supporters,) except in one point. That chapter in Appian is one of utter confusion in data and detail. He and Plutarch evidently have transcribed much if not all from one and the same source (Plut. Caes. 21) : I am not inclined to name Pollio with Kornemann : Livy is vastly more likely because the trend of the presentation is anti-Caesian. Appian transcribed with such haste as not to realize that he was dealing with Luca and related subjects, such haste indeed that he does not even name Luca, whereas Plutarch presents all this with much clearness and with slightly greater moderation : the point made in Plutarch's relation is that (many) candidates at R., as I said, got their electoral funds from Caesar, and when in office, requited him. How Ferrero can transcribe such things and still with a straight face insist that Caesar was a pretty loyal republican and did not strive for ultimate autocratic power, I fail to see. That "Roman Pericles" of Ferrero's is one of the many sophomoric things which dazzle the ignorant but cause the well informed to smile. Another pretty phrase which F. turned in his lathe is to call Caesar (II 165, 190) "questo poeta geniale della guerra e della politica", it would do credit to a high school miss speaking her piece in leafy June.

The sketch of public sentiment in Rome as it was immediately after the killing of Clodius¹ Jan. 52 (F. II 157) is typical. The things which Ferrero writes *are psychologically possible*, but he does there what a dramatist or a novelist may write, but he has no warrant to call such things historiography. Often does one think of Aristotle's *οἷα ἂν γένοιτο*, in the body of his dramaturgy.

The exasperation at Rome against Caesar for the long duration of the Northwestern wars is positively self constructed or autoschediastic on F.'s part. *If* there *had* been a press in Rome, and *if* we *had* the files of those journals—if—if—if.

It is tiresome to read of Ferrero's valuation of Caesar's Gallic Wars—even Besnier in the *Revue Historique* 1907 smiles at the rhetoric of F., as being somewhat ad captandam Franco-

¹ We really have nothing valuable but Asconius

gallorum benevolentiam—: “la guerre de Gaule a régénéré le monde antique”! a trumpet blast that would bring down the walls of Jericho indeed.

The *fait accompli* sits in judgement here too, and the very impressive historical fact that during all the titanic struggle of the two dynasts there was not, as far as we know, any serious enterprise or effort to cause a rising of the Kelts, either regional or national.—What the aristocracy hoped, (and, we may assume, hoped with great liveliness in 52, 51, 50 B. C.) was, that Caesar would perish, or would at least suffer some very serious reverses there. We may cite Caelius’ report to Cicero (in May 51), Fam. 8, 1, 4. Quod ad Caesarem, crebri et non belli de eo rumores, sed susurratores dumtaxat, veniunt: alius, equitem perdidisse, quod opinor certe factum est; alius, septimam legionem vapulasse, ipsum apud Bellovacos circumsederi interclusum ab reliquo exercitu; *neque adhuc certi quidquam est*, NEQUE HAEC INCERTA TAMEN VULGO IACTANTUR: vague news which the Caesarophobe Domitius *whispers into the ears of his friends*. Such hard facts chime but ill with Ferrero’s modernizing constructions.—Caelius in autumn 51 was not at all an enemy of Caesar’s: if F. had taken pains to have read all of Caelius’ letters in Fam. 8, and made a few simple notes he would not have committed blunders like this one. (F. II 240). How does F. know that Cassius in 51 was suspected of Caesarism? (II 244). Figure after figure the new historian takes up and tries so very hard to give them a new countenance, or a new dress or at least some ribbon or piece of tinsel, like a young girl coming into the possession of her older sister’s dolls. So Curio—of all men—is now, at once to be really respected as an *independent* politician or statesman (II 260–61). If ever there was a clever man ready for the highest bidder, *he* was that man, even if we choose to disregard Velleius’ phrase of the ‘ingeniosissime nequam’. How does Ferrero know that Curio went beyond Caesar’s orders? He forgets about Balbus.

We are—*si dis placet*—actually to believe that Caesar, in the autumn of 50, B. C., hoped for peace. The burden of all our texts, records, documents is to go for nothing. But shall we set them aside and accept Ferrero’s unsupported affirmations? Or has he had psychiatric revelations of his own? Or did Caesar appear to him in his dreams?

Signor Ferrero then tells us, that Caesar, in December 50 was utterly *surprised* at the possibility of a storm, which since the homicide near Bovillae, in Jan. 52, and since the subsequent coalition of Pompey and the aristocracy, had come to be one of the most definitely sure things within the entire range of coming events.

The correspondence of Cicero, ever since he left his province (Summer 50 B. C.) to turn his face homeward once more, shows us both in every line as well as between the lines how *certain* the approach of crisis and catastrophe was felt to be by every one.—The great question of Cicero, question chronic, persistent and deeply troublous, was this and this alone: Where shall I stand? With whom of the two shall I range myself? Is a neutral position at all possible? On Dec 10 Cicero (having landed in Brundisium on Nov. 25) conceived *this* alternative of future contingencies: 1. *concordia*, i. e. the repairing or closing of the breach now patent and palpable to the world. 2. *Sin boni vincuntur*, i. e. the defeat of Pompey and the conservatives (Att. 7, 3, 2), whereas Caesar's defeat is *not* conceived as a probable contingency, is not brought into these reflexions at all.

The situation is definite: *de sua potentia dimicant homines*, (i. e. the two dynasts) *hoc tempore (dimico goes well with the idea of a duel)*, *periculo civitatis* (§ 4). Caesar appears to Cicero on Dec. 10 as "*homo audacissimus paratissimusque*", i. e. relatively, comparing his situation with that of Pompey. The prevailing note which echoes and reechoes in Cicero's soul is: Too late! The time is close at hand when a man must call himself either a Caesarian or a Pompeian. If I do come out against Caesar, his Spaniard, Balbus, will perhaps dun me (Att. 7, 3, 11). *Sero enim resistimus ei, quem per annos decem aluimus contra nos* (Att. 7, 5, 5). Is Caesar to be a second Cinna or Sulla? (Att. 7, 7, 7).—But the most luminous of these monitory or forecasting utterances is this one, written late in December (Att. 7, 9, 2). "*Aut, addita causa, si forte tribunus pl. senatum impediens aut populum incitans (Antony did both) notatus aut senatus consulto circumscriptus (Antony shortly afterwards had this very experience) aut sublatus aut expulsus sit, dicensve se expulsus ad illum confugerit?*" I marvel that some Higher Critic does not assert

that this *must* be an ex post facto interpolation by some enemy of Caesar? If I live long enough, I firmly expect such a contribution to advanced scholarship to be made. But, really, is it not a very curious and detailed computation of a contingency so soon to become a historical reality pregnant with a portentous series of consequences? The Arpinate in a way was the chorus in that tragedy. Reviewing, then, the last nine years the orator clearly discerns the path of *one* mighty will, of *one* consistent and undeviating policy, he himself deriving little consolation from such pondering and rumination.

At this point it may be well to turn back a little and follow Cicero's own path and incidentally note some of Ferrero's peculiar or exclusive affirmations in that part of his *Grandezza*.

Sometimes one is tempted—when reading the lively recital of Cicero's Cilician proconsulate, to believe that for once Signor F. had settled down to a sober and painstaking study—genuine *study*—of the indispensable and exclusive texts, all of them, and every part of them. But at once we come upon a blunder of hurry or ignorance so grotesque that we doubt it all. Tullius Tiro: who, even superficially acquainted with Cicero but knows of him, and of his services and intimate literary relations and confidences—beyond all Boswells of later times; whose biography of Cicero has furnished the most precious things in Plutarch's Cicero and to whose early planning and consistent industry we owe our collections of Cicero's correspondence? Listen, dear reader, to the profound information of Signor Ferrero, which I quote in the original that no one may impute any unfairness to my own pen: “i segretari, tra i quali uno liberto che portava il suo stesso nome M. Tullio, e uno giovane schiavo Tirone. Poor Tiro! is such the reward of thy devotion that thou shouldest be rent in twain and reduced to a mere half of thy being after so many centuries!—To speak with moderation: When F. wrote his *Grandezza* he evidently read ad Atticum and ad Fam. for the first time, and then only piecemeal, and with superficial haste. Or is it not so? His reading evidently merely *ad hoc* and limping badly in the rear of his nimble pencilling. No wonder then, too that he refers to Ariobarzanes at that time ruling over Cappadocia (II 271) as *il vecchio re di Cappadocia*. Not acquainted with the text of the Cilician corre-

spondence in detail he confounded the youth (placed under Cicero's *tutela* by special action of the senate) with the latter's father. Att. 5, 18, 4 (iam exhibeo *pupillum*, neque defendo) cf. also Tyrrell's editing of the text of Fam. 15, 2, 5: *et tamen adolescentem esse* and § 6.—The reference in Ferrero's footnote, p. 278 (the defence of Cicero against the criticism "del Tyrrell e del Purser") shows clearly that Ferrero must be virtually ignorant of T. and P., for he classes them with Drumann (!) as unfair judges of Cicero's proconsulate! Indeed a *little* knowledge 'del Tyrrell e del Purser' is a dangerous thing. The world knows well that nowhere in modern classicism is there any fairer or better-balanced estimate of Cicero as well as of all the main persons occurring in his correspondence, than in Dr. Tyrrell's monumental work.—Terentia if we may trust the *only* authority we have, had *nothing* to do with the arrangement of poor Tullia's third and last matrimonial venture (F. II 280). In II 281 we read: "un certo Cresto, un giornalista di professione." In Cic. Fam. 2, 8, 1 Cicero quotes *ordinary news* from Rome with which he did not wish to be bothered, such as the pairing of gladiators, adjournments of trials, and "Chresti compilatio" which Tyrrell calls a 'robbery by Chrestus' an ordinary burglary. Why indeed if it meant "*compilation*"¹—how could a 'compilation' by a nobody be a piece of news for a Cicero? Compilation of what? And even if *compilatio* here should be taken in the modern (literary) sense, what warrant has the author of the *Grandezza* to call the poor devil Chrestus "a professional journalist"? Cheap and onesided to hit off a Cicero by such current commonplace as "uomo della penna" or "il vecchio scrittore". For if Ferrero had studied *all* the works and all the sequence of Cicero's life, he would know that to the Arpinate, when he felt himself master of himself, and in a *free* government (really free), literature was only a *second choice*, and his practice before the praetor urbanus was excelled probably *if* excelled by only *one* contemporary at the Roman bar, Servius Sulpicius, about whom Mr. F. must consult Pomponius in the introduction to the Digest of Roman Law.

Let us pause here to write down a few words of proper appreciation of Cicero's *de Republica* which F. glibly presents

¹ The Thesaurus probably caught napping here.

as the exposition of the political sentiments of *le alte classi*. The work as we know from a line of Caelius (Fam. 8, 1, 4) was published about the time in May 51 when Cicero in leisurely stages travelled towards Brundisium to embark for his proconsulate. "Tui politici libri omnibus vigent"—which means this: your books (on Political Science,) your treatise on the State is considered a strong production by everyone (i. e. who reads them).—How does Ferrero interpret the words of Caelius?: "questa ammirazione mondiale" (II 266), an absurd exaggeration. What made the work notable when Atticus put it out? It was absolutely the first book in finished Latin on such a theme, but we have not the slightest data in the extant fragments of the work for assuming that Cicero designed or projected any practical influence in affecting or directing political thought in his time. He *sums up* (as he had *summed up* in the preceding general work *de Oratore*): he draws a line under his life's total sum. He gives expression not at all to class-convictions *per se*: he is no mere pen or penciller of social prejudices or notions. To one, who has striven for several decades to gain a real familiarity with this unique and manysided man, a man so much half-understood and still more quarter-understood or held in fancied familiarity on account of a little spelling out of a few minor things, a man known by a few glimpses or juvenile incursions—to such a one I say who sifts all his works and the entire sequence of his career, there is a *very high degree* of *consistency* in Cicero's political theory and his concrete political judgements. This then is what I have elsewhere called a philosophical, an ethical conservatism. When he was composing this treatise he knew absolutely nothing of the possible contingency of a proconsulate for himself. Still by this book (as well as by Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*) was he willing to have his administration of Cilicia judged. One of the fundamental points (suggested also in the ultra-elaborate allegory in which the introduction is couched) was this, that he considered the double initiative in the Roman system of legislation an evil, and the Tribune in this connection a factor in public life which made genuine *unity* of the commonwealth simply impossible.¹—Aristocratic initiative and control however he conceives by no means in the narrow

¹Ludwig Lange holds the same view.

partisan sense of the Optimates of the day: e. g. "which always must be maintained in this state, viz. *that the most numerous class shall not count the most* (ne plurimum valeant plurimi II 39)—by which he means a firm control of the plebeian masses.

But concrete Roman history (II 54) much better than Plato's speculation, teaches us actual statesmanship and the best political lessons. Consciousness of *le alte classi*? Why, Cicero utterly condemns the social present as the *fait accompli* of a wretched decadence [and the *alte classi* certainly were the chief performers in this process]: *to his contemporaries that Rome which he knows and loves, is not even known any more, they have virtually ceased to read their Ennius. . . .*

But Rome even now decadent and decaying as it is, is still founded on the moral vigour and the stern fibre of the olden time. *That alone is the explanation of Roman greatness—qualities which remind the author of a fine painting which has become blurred through age. "Our time (V 2) has neglected to renew the colours, but has not even conserved the painting itself, its form and as it were its drawing. For what remains of ancient morality through which he (Ennius) said that the Roman state stood? A morality which we see so buried in oblivion that it is not even known".* For what shall I say of the men? Our time is a period of decadence. "Mores enim ipsi interierunt virorum penuria".—It is all an Elegy of the *Nevermore*.—Ferrero reveals not even a trace of genuine insight into the structure or essence of this treatise.—His incursions or raids into the domain of Roman literature are in the main woeful performances, superficial, sophomoric and glittering with the gold leaf of literary commonplace. After Bernhardt, Teuffel, Mommsen, Schanz, Ribbeck, Leo, Madvig, Robinson Ellis, Nettleship, Munro, Sir John Sandys, Tyrrell—to read his paragraphs is simply like biting on a small stone, whether he deals with Lucretius or Catullus or Cicero or Varro or any one else in this domain, or when he glibly writes of "*la vecchia epica monumentale di Ennio e Pacuvio*": so Pacuvius wrote epic too.

"Denn wo Begriffe fehlen, stellt schnell das Wort sich ein". The way in which Ferrero works up Att. 9, 18, the report by Cicero of his conference with Caesar at his Formianum, in

March 49 may be called semi-novelistic or semi-journalistic or what you like, but it is not warranted by the text, is not derivable from the spirit or the words of that communication.

What were Cicero's motives in May-June (49) for joining Pompey in Epirus? Listen to the novel sociological explanation (II 379): "per un supremo rinvigorisamento della sua devozione *di borghese timido verso questo gran signor*". Indeed? Cicero who said "Cedant arma togae, concedat laurea laudi", a *borghese timido* towards any living being in his own generation?

Borghese timido may sound pretty in a Parisian *salon*, but it is stark nonsense. We have here a wealth of data. Cicero since 63 rated himself not lower than any man in public life; not lower than Pompey. His exile added enormously to what we may call his political self-esteem, for he considered himself a martyr for the cause of order, law, property, decency, morals. As he rated the Luculli Hortensii, etc. lower, he certainly rated himself higher. He was in a word much prouder than the average aristocrat, for he owed everything to himself. The S. C. which designated him *Pater Patriae* after the Nones of December 63 was no common or mean thing. No part of his own self-communion exhibits a harder or more beaten path than the favorite mood in which he compares himself with the aristocracy whom at almost all points he had so palpably outshone from the beginning. And even that distinction, gained with legions and eagles in the ever widening periphery of the empire, he did not hesitate to challenge.

And so, early in 62, soon after the expiration of his consular year, when the impending return of Pompey from the East was looming ever larger in the public eye, he wrote (pro Sulla 26): *sibi haberent honores, sibi imperia, sibi triumphos, sibi alia praeclarae laudis insignia*" etc. While even then Theophanes of Mytilene had begun to make Pompey's achievements the theme of his pen, we know with what feverish persistence¹ Cicero made or strove to have made lasting literary record of his consular achievements. We take note of the fact that Cicero composed his *περὶ ὑπατείας* in what was *then* the language of world-fame, Greek, *before* he wrote his Latin memoir: that he wrote the Latin Epic himself, but failed in his efforts

¹ Cf. Plut. Cic. 22.

to stir Archias or old Posidonius in Rhodes to propagate his renown in finished Greek. *Timido borghese?* It was in 62 too that Cicero sent to Pompey in the East a memoir on the same subject, the all-engrossing subject of how he had curbed and at last destroyed a domestic revolution. In form this was a "letter". But what a letter. The scroll was bulkier than many libri. "Nam significat epistulam non mediocrem *ad instar voluminis* scriptam, quam Pompeio in Asiam *De Rebus suis in consulatu gestis* miserat Cicero, *aliquanto* ut videbatur, *insolenter scriptam* (presumptuous, rather) ut Pompei stomachum non mediocriter commoveret: quod *quadam superbiore iactantia omnibus se gloriosis ducibus anteponeret*. (Schol. Bob. 270-71 Or.)

Pompey's rejoinder seems to have been slight or slighting. We possess Cicero's second epistle, brief, but very proud indeed. If, in striking the balance between us *my* services are the greater—so much the better for my self-respect! "Nulla enim re tam laetari soleo quam meorum officiorum conscientia, quibus si quando non mutue respondetur, apud me plus officii residere facile patior" (Fam. 5, 7, 2).

A great orator in public life has a certain affinity with a great actor, but he is something more, for he must have some elements of real greatness both in character and ideals. In the clash of titanic forces when the Caeliuses, Sallusts, Curios, Dolabellas were swayed by material considerations mainly, and were like donkeys turning towards the bigger bundles of hay, Cicero even then kept true to his finer convictions, he was indeed *sui generis*, he was what the Germans call "*ein innerlicher Mensch*", swayed largely by finer and nobler sentiments—*προσπέπονθα τῷ καλῷ* he once wrote to his friend¹—'too much so for my material advantage'. To be called *ungrateful* was something he could not endure even to conceive in his mind.

His *political* judgement in the spring of 49 condemned Pompey. He was however, as I have said elsewhere, not only one of the most *grateful* men of history, but also firm in his gratitude and prepared for very positive sacrifices and even calamities in such resolutions. It was this which made him cross the Adriatic to Durazzo. His soul readily and power-

¹ Att. 2, 19, 1.

fully echoed with lines, which became a force within him, because his general character gave them lodgement and decisive influence, and these things happened not in the quiet musings of a library but in a mighty tempest, when the consideration of to be or not to be ever dwelled before the souls of men. It was then that certain lines of Homer burned themselves into his soul (Att. 9, 5, 3): "Ego igitur, siquidem apud Homerum, cui et mater et dea dixisset

αὐτίκα γάρ τοι ἔπειτα μεθ' Ἑκτορα πότμος ἐτοῖμος,

matri ipse (scil. Achilles) respondet

αὐτίκα τεθναίην, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρ' ἐμὲλλον ἐταίρῳ
κτεινομένῳ ἐπαμῦναι . . .

It will be my ruin, but I must go. A soul such as Cicero's was is not filled with any class-consciousness but it is the possession of, it marks a very specific, a unique personality. And so too, when all this was over he spoke (or published) in the autumn of 46 (pro Marcello 14), a perfect confirmation of the sentiments and the pencillings of the spring of 49: *Hominem sum secutus privato officio, non publico, tantumque apud me grati animi fidelis memoria* valuit, ut nulla non modo cupiditate, sed ne spe quidem, prudens et sciens tamquam ad interitum ruerem voluntarium.—'Timido borghese'!

As to Cicero's difference with Terentia and his motives for a divorce we *have* data, which F. could have found in the letters of Cicero, or at least in Drumann. Or if he will take Orelli's *Onomasticon* s. v. "*Philotimus*, libertus, ut videtur, Terentiae potius quam Ciceronis" and verify all the references there given he will probably solve the problem. Like other writers who spread a knowledge (which cannot be critical in many details) over a very large surface, Saintsbury for instance, Ferrero hastily classifies or designates the philosophical books of Cicero's last years as swayed largely by the type of the Platonic dialogue.—"Riassumere la filosofia Greca in un seguito di dialoghi simili a quelli di Platone"—: as every classical scholar knows—not at all, in their *form*, nor in any other way, either. The positive dramatic art of Plato Cicero knew well was beyond him. It was Aristotle's form of dialogue, which Cicero in the main followed, and all this although he derived from Plato's State (*deus ille noster Plato*

Att. 4, 16, 3) certain material incentives: though, what freedom of original construction if we compare the *Somnium Scipionis* with the vision of Er the Armenian!—

Cicero does not develop any system of his own. Some *one* speaker or lecturer we would say presents the doctrine of *one* school on the main topic of the treatise. These relations are really didactic presentations of systems extant and consummated, while the Academy of Carneades furnishes the *aqua fortis* of keen analysis and freer valuation of Stoa and Garden. For these two really were the great systems of the day. Cicero was a practical eclectic, not the devotee of any one school, although he owed his dialectic largely to Philo and Antiochos, and his deeper ethical conceptions to the Stoa in the main. It is clear that any genuine repristination of the Platonic art even as a literary form, at this stage of ancient civilization had become quite impossible, even if a Latin Plato had arisen. It may be well to cite here what Cicero wrote to Atticus in June 45 (Att. 13, 19, 4): Quae autem his temporibus scripsi, 'Ἀριστοτέλειον morem habent, in quo sermo ita inducitur ceterorum, ut penes ipsum sit principatus etc.) in short a didactic rather than a dramatic presentation. Special students of Aristotle¹ use this very passage to reconstruct some clearer notion of that thinker's Dialogues.

But to return to Caesar. The flank movement of Pompey's cavalry at Pharsalos was *not* directed mainly at Caesar's cavalry—a negligible force on that day—but at his right wing and indeed at his entire position (Caes. B. C. 3, 93). The date, Aug. 9 of the Roman calendar, was about June 6, 48 by the solar year, not *end* of June.—The boyish age of the last Ptolemy (p. 423) seems to have escaped Ferrero.—As for Pompey, he was by no means a typical aristocrat at all, the ambition of his life, from Sulla's return onward was to stand *apart* from, to be revered as one standing *above* the parties. No less than Caesar, Pompey was *sui generis* through and through.

Diochares is called by Ferrero "uno dei piu celeri schiavi di Cesare", but Att. 11, 6, 7: "quaere ex Diochare, Caesaris *liberto*".—When the news of Pompey's death reached Rome, whence did F. derive this? "Scoppiò in tutti i ceti un furore

¹As e. g. Heitz. Die verlorenen Schriften des Aristoteles.

di entusiasmo per lui". The question is not as to what was *psychologically possible*, but *what we know about it*. How does F. tell of the manner in which Cleopatra captured Caesar? By reciting the entire gamut of psychological or physiological *possibilities* (2, 430). He never mentions Lucan who was so much nearer Livy than Dio.—As for Servius Sulpicius, one must not class him as a Caesarian at all.—Is there anywhere, even in Cicero's writings, a nobler elegy on the passing of the Republic than that exquisite letter of consolation sent by the jurist in Achaia to the bereaved Cicero? (Fam. 4, 5). "Cogita quemadmodum adhuc fortuna nobiscum egerit: ea nobis erepta esse, quae hominibus non minus quam liberi cara esse debent, patriam, honestatem, dignitatem, honores omnes" (ib. § 2). Sulpicius simply accepted the iron logic of results, but his affection for the old order was not a whit less deep and sincere, than that of Cicero.—When F. says of the schoolboy king of Egypt: "Tolomeo era morto *durante la guerra*", one receives the impression that the exact date of his death was unknown: but he perished in the Nile with his golden corselet on, on Mch. 27 (Fasti Praenestini).

The influence of the Alexandrian life and incidental pleasures on Caesar are mere psychological speculations (2,444), we really know nothing about them. The campaign of Thapsus is done in a great hurry and it is not likely that F. has devoted any serious study to that admirable report, the *Bellum Africum*. Ferrero's knowledge of even the barest outline is so poor that he actually has Cato *flee to Utica after the battle*, whereas the Stoic was in command there during the entire campaign. These things (and *many* others for the enumeration of which there is no space) show, with what hurried and superficial procedure Ferrero, in the main, compiled his first two volumes. His great ambition (viz. to be as un-Mommsenian or anti-Mommsenian as possible) tempts him constantly into constructions which are untenable, fanciful, or absurd.—With Mommsen Caesar is the "Monarch" as soon as he crossed the Rubicon, while F. (2, 455) informs us: "sebbene avesse incominciato la guerra non per ambizione del supremo potere" etc. add pp. 456, 458.—Of Caesar's 'discourse' in the Senate (after returning from the Thapsus campaign via Sardinia) we are not so sure. We have only the written speech

of Dio (43, 15-18), the consistent imitator of Thucydides. It is quite risky to treat this speech, (this Dionian ratiocinative presentation of that situation) as history, as F. does. We lack support of Dio.—Why were the ‘*elogi di Catone*’—‘*stupididi*’? (475).

As to Cleopatra in Rome and as to her departure from the park of Caesar a few matters should be made clear.—Here again we see, that F. has merely *browsed* in Cicero’s correspondence (F. 2, 476), but has not taken pains to make an exhaustive study of the same. We know, then, that Cleopatra was still in the capital during the Ides and even some time later. F. got *his* version from Suet. Caes. 52 in part. But Cicero wrote at Sinuessa, on April 15, 44 B. C., a full month after the Ides (Att. 14, 8, 1): “Reginae fuga (i. e. hurried departure from Rome) mihi non molesta est”.—On May 11 he plainly intimates his hope that Cleopatra may have had a miscarriage (Att. 14, 20, 2): “Tertullae nollem abortum (wife of Cassius), tam enim Cassii sunt quam Bruti serendi. *De regina velim* atque etiam de Caesare illo. Cf. Tyrrell’s note.—About Caesar’s Anticato F. says: “per confutare l’ideologia repubblicana che pareva (where?) rifiorire”. . . . The traces of Caesar’s monograph in Plutarch’s Cato min. (11, 36, 52, 54) and elsewhere (Plin. Ep. 3, 12). and the activities of Hirtius are not unknown to us (Att. 12, 40, 1). “Qualis futura sit *Caesaris vituperatio* contra *laudationem meam* perspexi ex eo libro, quem Hirtius ad me misit, in quo *vitia Catonis colligit*”. The pretty phrase of F. above is pure fancy. But we have no space to puncture all the iridescent soap-bubbles of Signor Ferrero.

The *Bellum Hispaniense* with its precious report of Caesar’s address at Corduba seems to be unknown to the Italian writer.—“This address is presented with a vigour and with forceful antitheses of the rhetorical art, which were simply beyond the poor literary powers of this writer. The angry pride of Caesar breathes from every sentence with the living pulse-beat of truth and psychological concinnity”.¹

The project of changing the course of the Tiber is mentioned by Cicero *before* Caesar’s return from the Munda-campaign. (Att. 13, 33, 4)—There was no indignation at Rome

¹ Annals of Caes. 288.

at the prospect *per se* of a Parthian campaign. Ferrero's inferences from Att. 13, 31, 3 are hasty.—In drawing on Suet. 77 about Caesar's last period, F. overlooks the important words; "ut T. Ampius (one of the bitterest anti-Caesarian writers of the times) scribit". Caesar's sober dinner as Cicero's guest down at the Puteolanum (Dec. 45) with their discussions of literary topics (Att. 13, 52) is designated by F. as "orgia"!—While thus utterly perverting the traceable and definite things, F., like a psychiatric expert, presents the invisible factors in Caesar's soul.—How does F. know, (App. 2, 107) that Caesar's Spanish guards were *slaves*? (2,499).

Among the more ambitious paradoxes of Ferrero is his new estimate of Brutus. We know *Caesar's* estimate of that peculiar character: his "quicquid hic volt, valde volt", his manner of argumentation so impressed that eminent judge of character, Caesar (Att. 14, 1, 2). Brutus later divorced a Claudia and married the daughter of the man whom of *all* men of his generation Caesar seems to have abominated most. Also Brutus glorified the Stoic in every way and devoted himself very largely to what we would call the source-study of the Old Republic. We had been considering him really a character of extraordinary persistence. No longer! We now learn from the new historian that Brutus was *debole*, a weak character (p. 507). And, once having made his diagnosis he abides by it.—Antony and Lepidus, in the session of March 17, in the temple of Tellus did *not* have a majority. Was there any amnesty at Athens "from time to time"? Cicero certainly means that connected with the democratic restoration by Thrasybulus. Who knows of any other?

Another entirely novel thing: (III, p. 37) Antony's funeral oration consisted merely of a few sentences (App. 2, 145 sqq.). We may perhaps set aside the biographical discourse in Dio (44, 36-49) as a Thucydidean composition. F. seems to follow Suetonius 84: "*Laudationis loco* consul Antonius per praeconem pronuntiavit senatus consulta, quibus omnia simul ei divina atque humana decreverat, item ius iurandum quibus *per pauca a se verba addidit*". Still Cicero calls it a *contio*, and we see that it was spread broadcast all over Italy within a few weeks (Att. 14, 11, 1). Therefor Ferrero's pronouncement: "il discorso incendiario di Antonio è una

leggenda" (III, p. 37) is not quite certain. Atticus rated that discourse as a *decisive* political act in destroying the public security of the regicides. But what did Atticus know about it? And what becomes of Lange's other references, Plut. Anton. 14, Brut. 20; Att. 14, 14, 3, and particularly Cic. 2 Phil. 2, 91: tua *illa* pulchra *laudatio* (famous within a very short time) tua *miseratio*, tua *cohortatio*: there must have been a very substantial *plus* beyond what Suetonius relates. But what did Cicero know about it?

If nothing durable was founded by Caesar, as Ferrero affirms, why then the immediate succession and the struggles of the pretenders? Hirtius (III 69) "became a Caesarian once more". He had never been anything else. His very books to supplement Caesar were written after the Ides and before January 1, 43 B. C.

The Ituraean archers of Antony are called purchased slaves by Ferrero (3, 80). What is his authority? There is no sober reason for censuring Cicero for his desire to go to Greece in the summer of 44 B. C. Absurd to call the man *timido* who delivered the First Philippic and the others in that swan's song of the Roman Republic.

What Antony feared in the summer and autumn of 44 was *not* the Conservatives, but Caesar's heir.—The time of Dola-bella's departure for the East is known.—Roman history, not Aristotle, was the real basis of Cicero's political theory (F. 3, 133).

The real point of time when Octavian, in 43 B. C. seems to have determined to throw Cicero over was probably soon after he heard of Cicero's epigram, in May. The letter of Decimus Brutus telling of it is dated at Eporedia (Ivrea) at the foot of the Alps, May 25 (Fam. II, 20, 1), "narrat mihi apud Caesarem se fuisse multumque sermonem de te habitum esse; ipsum Caesarem (Octavian) nihil sane de te questum nisi dictum (one of Cicero's bon-mots) quod diceret te dixisse: "laudandum adolescentem, ornandum, tollendum". . . . as Suetonius (Aug. 12) relates it: "ad praetextum mutatae voluntatis".—As to the last summer of Cicero's life, few things are as illuminating as the letters of Pollio from Southern Spain written to the man who still then was his literary ideal. And yet, with that characteristic bluntness of his

(Fam. 10, 31-33) he avowed to Cicero his friendship for Antony and for Plancus. He went so far in the first of those letters, which otherwise was cordial, as to censure Antony for having abandoned the siege of Mutina. We see that Caesar's real friends desired no truce or composition with the regicides.—The strong anti-Ciceronian strain in Appian from the Ides of March to Cicero's death seems to be due however to the *Historiae* of the very same Asinius Pollio, written after Actium 31 B. C. The data are fairly familiar and are placed in correlation by Kornemann.¹ Soon after the establishment of the Second Triumvirate Pollio, under the pressure of circumstances, abandoned what friendly feelings for Cicero he may have secretly cultivated up to a point of time not long before. So far indeed was he carried away by the interests of the new dynasts and by his adjustment to their interests, that in a speech pro Lamia (not very long after Cicero's foul death) he even referred to Cicero's character with contempt (Sen. Suas. 6, 14). The severest charge however is contained in these words: (ib. § 15) "Huic certe actioni pro Lamia (one of the proscribed of 43 B. C.) qui interfuerunt *negant* eum haec dixisse—nec enim mentiri sub triumvirorum conscientia sustinebat—*sed postea composuisse*". But he did not dare to put it into his *historiae*, some twelve years later. Ferrero's "La vera importanza storica di Cicerone" (F. 3, 255) are fervid paragraphs meant to be impressive, but largely negligible by serious students. Too often has Ferrero betrayed ignorance or at best hurried acquaintance with the very extensive writings of the Arpinate; p. 254 sounds like a little sediment from Zielinski, but it is quite immaterial whether it is or not. The shallow absurdity of the former journalist however will out: "la importanza storica di Cicerone non solo eguaglia quella di Cesare, ma è di poco inferiore a quella di Gesù, di Paolo, di Agostino". How can any sober student of human history take such declamation seriously!

E. G. SIHLER.

UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS, NEW YORK.

¹ Die historische Schriftstellerei des Asinius Pollio 1896.